

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 10, 11, 13-17, 19-27, 32, 33 and 41-44 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 7, 11, 16, 19, 23, 27, 41, 43 and 44 have been amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, the drawings were objected to; claims 1-6, 10, 11, 13-17, 19-22, 24-33 and 41-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; claims 1-6, 10, 11, 13-17, 19-22 and 24-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; claims 1-6, 10, 11, 13-17, 19-22, 24-27, 32, 33 and 41-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kitahara et al. in view of Shoji et al. and Microsoft Corp.; claims 7 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kitahara et al. in view of NOAA; and claims 7 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kitahara et al. in view of Weather Channel Interactive, Inc.

Objections to the Drawings

The Office Action indicates Figure 1 should be labeled "prior art". However, it is respectfully noted Figure 1 is not discussed in the background of the invention and is not described as being prior art. Rather, Figure 1 is described as illustrating a general operating environment suitable for one or more aspects of an illustrative embodiment of the invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted it would be improper to label Figure 1 "prior art". Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this objection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 112, First and Second Paragraphs

Regarding the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs, the term “terrestrial condition” has been removed from the claims and the claims that have been amended clarify that the first, second and third attributes are used together to define an aspect of the weather condition. Accordingly, it is respectfully these rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-6, 10, 11, 13-17, 19-22, 24-27, 32, 33 and 41-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kitahara et al. in view of Shoji et al. and Microsoft Corp. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 includes a combination of elements and has been amended to clarify that the first, second and third attributes are used together to define the aspect of the weather condition for each individual cell in the plurality of multi-dimensional arrays such that the user can define different weather conditions for each individual cell in the plurality of multi-dimensional arrays. Independent claims 16, 27 and 41 include similar features in a varying scope.

These features are supported at least by the non-limiting examples shown in Figures 12 and 13 and described in the specification at paragraph [095]. For example, paragraph [095] of the present application describes that a user can define unique weather for each individual cell in the array 1201 (see also Figure 12). Thus, the first, second and third attributes are used together to define the aspect of the weather condition for each individual cell in the plurality of the multi-

dimensional array such that the user can define different weather conditions for each individual cell in the plurality of multi-dimensional arrays. This is particularly advantageous because the user is given great flexibility in defining weather patterns.

The Office Action relies on the newly cited reference by Microsoft Corp. as setting user defined clouds and other weather conditions at different layers above the earth. It is respectfully noted Microsoft is the same assignee in the present invention. Further, as shown in pages 66 and 67 of the Applied Microsoft handbook, the user is only able to define a single pattern for a particular layer and is not given the flexibility to define weather patterns for each individual cell as in the present invention. Kitahara et al. and Shoji et al. also do not teach or suggest these features. That is, in both Kitahara et al. and Shoji et al., the user is only able to define general large scale areas and is not given the flexibility as in the present invention.

Further regarding the rejection of claims 7 and 23/22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), it is respectfully submitted these rejections have also been overcome as independent claims 7 and 23 include similar features as independent claims 1, 16, 27 and 41. As discussed above, Kitahara et al. does not teach or suggest these features. Further, NOAA and the Weather Channel Interactive, Inc. also do not teach or suggest defining weather conditions for each individual cell in a plurality of multi-dimensional arrays. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested these rejections also be withdrawn.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1, 7, 16, 23, 27 and 41 and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Application No.: 10/780,649
Amendment dated March 28, 2008
Reply to Office Action of December 28, 2007

Docket No.: 5486-0185PUS1

CONCLUSION

All matters having been addressed in view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the immediate allowance of all pending claims.

Applicant's undersigned representative remains ready to assist the Examiner in any way to facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this matter. If any point remains an issue in which the Examiner feels would be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact David A. Bilodeau at 703-205-8072.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account No. 02-2448. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any overpayments to the above-referenced deposit account.

Dated: March 28, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant